

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit): CB02-MRA3

2. Project Name: Yankee Run Right Fork Instream Project	3. County: Coos
4. Project Sponsor: Coos Bay BLM – Scott Lightcap/Pam Olson	5. Date: 2/13/02
6. Sponsors Phone Number: 541 751-4276	
7. Sponsors E-mail: scott_lightcap@blm.gov pamela_olson@blm.gov	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)

Coquille SubBasin (1710030505)

East Fork Coquille River

Township 28 Range 11 Section(s) 17;

Coos Bay BLM District, Myrtlewood Resource Area

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

This is a watershed restoration project whose primary goals are to reduce existing risks to aquatic species/habitats and to restore habitat quality and connectivity for aquatic and riparian dependent species. The project is designed to implement objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, as described in the Northwest Forest Plan including maintaining and restoring: watershed complexity, aquatic ecosystem connectivity, water quality, natural instream flows, sediment regimes, and native species. Project specific objectives are to increase spawning habitat, over-wintering habitat for juvenile salmonids and other aquatic organisms, and add to the complexity of the existing habitat.

10. Project Description: (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)

This is an instream wood placement project consisting of the placement of approximately 80 pieces of wood into sixteen large wood complexes (jams). This project will begin at river mile 0.1 on Right Fork Yankee Run Creek and will be approximately 0.6 mile in length. Wood will be placed in such a manner as to simulate natural wood delivery and accumulation in the stream channel. Wood would be placed using a mobile yarder. Care will be taken to minimize damage to the surrounding vegetation. Ground disturbance is expected to be minimal.

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?

☒ Yes ☐ No **If yes, then describe:**

In 2000, an instream project within the left fork of Yankee Run Creek included the placement of 100 pieces of wood to improve spawning habitat, over-wintering habitat for juveniles, and increase habitat complexity. Culvert replacements to improve fish passage are currently proposed for both Yankee Run Right Fork and Yankee Run Left Fork Creeks.

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- ☒ Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]
- ☒ Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]
- ☒ Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- ☒ Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]
- ☒ Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]

- a. Total Acres: N/A
- b. Total Miles: 0.6
- c. No. Structures: 15
- d. Est. People Reached: N/A
- e. No. Laborer Days: 20
- f. Other (specify): N/A

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)]

Duration: 5 days **Completion Date:** September 2002

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable)

This project is expected to benefit a variety of fish and wildlife species including, but not limited to coho salmon, steelhead trout, cutthroat trout and lamprey.

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec.

2(b)(3)] This project is expected to foster cooperative relationships among individuals and groups with diverse interests because it focuses on an area of agreement rather than controversy. Regardless of differing views on other aspects of public land management, clean water and healthy streams, and supporting stable populations of native fish and wildlife species are long-term ecological goals that most Coos Bay District user's support.

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities.**

This project is considered to be in the best public interest because it contributes positively toward maintaining and enhancing water quality and fish and wildlife habitat for both current and future generations of Federal Land users. Additionally, implementation of the project may benefit the community by providing local employment opportunities.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

The project is expected to improve spawning habitat, over-wintering habitat for juveniles, and will enhance habitat complexity. Currently spawning gravel is limited in this portion of Sandy Creek, and redds (gravel salmon nests) often become superimposed (dug up by other spawning fish). The addition gravels collected by these improved wood complexes is expected to improve the quality of the spawning habitat and thus reducing the amount of redd superimposition. This, along with increased habitat complexity, will hopefully increase juvenile survival and ultimately the number of returning adults. It will also help increase population viability for other vertebrate and invertebrate species that exist on public land by increasing habitat complexity.

20. Status of Project Planning

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| a. NEPA Complete: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| If no, give est. date of completion: | | | |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment

☒ Contract

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]

☐ Yes ☒ No

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$28,000
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

Item	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
	Fed. Agency	Requested	Other	Total
	Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Available Funds
24. Project Development/NEPA		\$1,500		\$1,500
25. Contracting		\$25,000		\$25,000
26. Monitoring		\$1,500		\$1,500
27. Total Cost Estimate				\$28,000

28. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

Agency appropriated funds may be available at some time in the future, but currently there are more restoration opportunities than there is funding available.

29. Monitoring Plan [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

- a. **What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] **Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

BLM Fisheries Biologist - Spawning surveys on Yankee Run Creek are conducted every year by the Coos Bay BLM, Myrtlewood RA; in addition, stream restoration projects are commonly monitored by conducting cross-sections and photo points. Changes in the stream morphology, i.e. its profile, could be observed. This project would have at least this level of monitoring.

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

- b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

The District Manager – This project will be considered successful at emphasizing local employment and training opportunities if local contractors are hired to complete the road improvement work and if local contractors, high school students, YCC groups, or other local interest groups are trained and utilized to complete monitoring activities

- c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from federal lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item? N/A**

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, item 33)**
Amount: \$1,500 for photo points, cross sections, and spawning surveys

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

County Commissioner Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of _____ County have reviewed this proposed Public Law 106-393 project for the BLM Coos Bay District Advisory Council and agree with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by Commissioner

Date

Comments/Rational: